



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

31/2004			
01/2004	Michael John O'Loughlin	5308-395	1454
03/14/2006		EXAMINER	
EY & SAJOVE	C	DEO, DUY V	U NGUYEN
			
RALEIGH, NC 27627		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1765	<u> </u>
1		03/14/2006 EY & SAJOVEC	EY & SAJOVEC DEO, DUY V

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office A. Commence	10/790,406	O'LOUGHLIN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	DuyVu n. Deo	1765		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONED	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 M	arch 2004.			
	action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) 1-28 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	-···	···		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau		d III tills ivational Stage		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	` ''	d.		
		-		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/790,406 Page 2

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-20, drawn to a process of making the product, classified in class 438, subclass 167.
- II. Claims 21-28, drawn to a product, classified in class 257, subclass 77.

 The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
- 2. Inventions in group I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by another and materially different process such as one that does not require the step of etching the first layer of epitaxial silicon carbide to reduce the thickness of the first layer or growing a second layer of epitaxial silicon carbide on the etched first layer of epitaxial silicon carbide.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/790,406 Page 3

Art Unit: 1765

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. A telephone call was made to Daivd Hall on 3/7/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DuyVu n. Deo whose telephone number is 571-272-1462.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner Duy-Vu N. Deo 3/8/06

20